

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 6, 2005. Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15 to 46, 63, 65 and 67 to 70 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 9 and 12 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Applicants thank the Examiner for her continued indication of allowable subject matter in claims 64 and 66. Based on the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance, found at page 13 of the Office Action, independent claims 1, 9 and 12 have all been amended so as to specify that candidate folders are identified through a comparison of a feature of a new document with an average of features of documents stored in a folder among the plurality of folders. Claims 62, 64 and 66 have been consequently canceled. Others changes have been made to the claims, as detailed more fully below, wherefore it is believed that all claims are fully in condition for allowance.

First, in response to the objections lodged against claims 1 and 9, the phrase "in other of the plurality of folders" has been changed to "others" of the plurality of folders. This language seems appropriate under the circumstances of the searching and candidate identification recited in the claims.

Second, new claims 68 to 70 have been added so as to provide antecedence for the notification means and notification step recited in others of the dependent claims. These claims were omitted through oversight from the amendment dated December 23, 2004, which deleted the notification means and notification step from independent claims 1, 9 and 12 without providing corresponding antecedence for other claims that modified these features.

Third, claims 35 to 37, 39 to 41 and 43 to 45 have been amended to add a notification means or a notification step, for reasons similar to those noted above.

Fourth, a few formal changes have been made to the claims, such as that in claim 19, to attend to matters turned up in a final review of the claims. Likewise, claim dependency has been adjusted as appropriate.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims herein are in condition for allowance.

The Office Action had entered rejections of claims 1, 3, 15 to 17, 23, 28 and 29 over U.S. Patent No. 5,751,287 (Hahn) and U.S. Patent No. 5,222,234 (Wang); and had entered rejections of claims 4, 9, 10, 12, 13, 18 to 22, 24 to 27, 30 to 42 and 62 to 65 over Hahn, Wang and U.S. Patent No. 5,832,470 (Morita). The foregoing actions have been taken without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter, and without conceding correctness of the rejections entered against the claims, and strictly to obtain an earlier allowance.

No other matters being raised in the Office Action, it is believed the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael K. O'Neill
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 32,622

FTTSPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 97067v1